

Remarks

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 13-16, 18-19, 21-23 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the reference “McAfee Total Protection for your PC - McAfee Utilities Version 4.0 User’s Guide” (hereinafter referred to as “the McAfee Manual”). Further, claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the article entitled “Description of the Low Disk Space Notification Tool in Windows XP” (hereinafter referred to as “the Disk Space Tool article”). Furthermore, claims 7 and 20 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the article entitled “How to Use the Backup Utility to Back Up Files and Folders in Windows XP Home Edition” (hereinafter referred to as “the Backup Tool article”). In addition, claims 11 and 24 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the article entitled “Disk Defragmenter Error Codes” (hereinafter referred to as “the Error Codes article”). Finally, claims 12 and 25 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of “The Complete Idiot’s Guide to Windows XP” (hereinafter referred to as “McFedries”).

Turning to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 13-16, 18-19, 21-23 and 26-28, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28 so as to distinctly and particularly point out the attributes of the present invention and to overcome the rejection and to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant has

cancelled claims 2-3, 9-10, 15-16, 22-23 and 27 from further consideration in this application, as shown in the attached claims. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

In particular, Applicant has amended the claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28 to reflect embodiments of the invention for automatically scheduling performance of maintenance tasks to maintain at least one server in a distributed computing environment by monitoring server conditions in the server to dynamically detect at least one predetermined criterion for performing at least one maintenance task on the server in the distributed computing environment, where the predetermined criterion comprises low disk space on the server and for automatically performing the maintenance task in response to the monitoring of the predetermined criterion on the server in the distributed computing environment, and where the maintenance task comprises reducing a size of log files stored on the server in the distributed computing environment in response to the low disk space that is detected. Applicant contends that the McAfee Manual does not teach the present claims of monitoring server conditions in a distributed computing environment to dynamically detect the predetermined criterion comprising low disk space on the server, such that, the predetermined criterion leads to the automatic performance of the maintenance task of reducing the size of log files stored on the server in the distributed computing environment. Given that the McAfee Manual does not disclose the

present amended claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the presently amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28 under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the McAfee Manual be withdrawn and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the presently amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28.

Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 4 and 17 under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the Disk Space Tool article. In particular, Applicant has cancelled claims 4 and 17, thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 4 and 17 under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the Disk Space Tool article be withdrawn.

Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 7 and 20 under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the Backup Tool article. Applicant contends that the presently amended claims 7 and 20 reflect embodiments of the invention for automatically scheduling performance of maintenance tasks to maintain at least one server in a distributed computing environment by monitoring server conditions in the server to dynamically detect at least one predetermined criterion for performing at least one maintenance task on the server in the distributed computing environment, where the predetermined criterion comprises low disk space on the server and for automatically performing the maintenance task in response to the monitoring of the predetermined criterion on the server in the distributed computing environment, and where the maintenance task comprises reducing a size of log files stored on the server in

the distributed computing environment in response to the low disk space that is detected. Applicant contends that the McAfee Manual does not teach the present claims of monitoring server conditions in a distributed computing environment to dynamically detect the predetermined criterion comprising low disk space on the server, such that, the predetermined criterion leads to the automatic performance of the maintenance task of reducing the size of log files stored on the server in the distributed computing environment. Further, Applicant contends that the McAfee Manual does not teach the presently amended claims of automatically saving configurations and authorizations for instances of applications running on a server when a low disk space condition is detected on the server in a distributed computing environment, in order to reduce the size of the log files on the server in the distributed computing environment. Furthermore, Applicant contends that the Backup Tool article does not teach the present claims of automatically saving configurations and authorizations for instances of applications running on a server when a low disk space condition is detected on the server in the distributed computing environment, in order to reduce the size of the log files on the server in the distributed computing environment. Accordingly, Applicant contends that given that the combined teachings of the McAfee Manual and the Backup Tool article do not teach the presently amended claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims 7 and 20 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the Backup Tool article be withdrawn and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the presently amended claims 7 and 20.

Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 11 and 24 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the Error Codes article. Applicant contends that the McAfee Manual does not teach the presently amended claims of monitoring server conditions to dynamically detect the predetermined criterion comprising low disk space on the server, such that, the predetermined criterion leads to the automatic performance the maintenance task of reducing the size of log files stored on the server in the distributed computing environment in response to the low disk space criterion detected. Further, Applicant contends that the McAfee Manual does not teach automatically alerting an administrator when a maintenance task performed on a server in the distributed computing environment fails. Further, Applicant contends that the Error Codes article does not teach automatically alerting an administrator when a maintenance task performed in response to a low disk space error on a server in the distributed computing environment fails. Applicant contends that the Error Codes article simply teaches what the different error codes signify and does not teach automatically alerting an administrator when a maintenance task performed (namely, reducing the size of the log files stored on the server in the distributed computing environment) in response to a low disk space error fails. Accordingly, Applicant contends that given that the combined teachings of the McAfee Manual and the Error Codes article do not teach the presently amended claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims 11 and 24 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of the Error Codes article be withdrawn and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the presently amended claims 11 and 24.

Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 12 and 25 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of McFedries. Applicant contends that the McAfee Manual does not teach the presently amended claims of monitoring server conditions to dynamically detect the predetermined criterion comprising low disk space on the server, such that, the predetermined criterion leads to the automatic performance of the maintenance task of reducing the size of the log files stored on the server in the distributed computing environment in response to the low disk space criterion detected on the server in the distributed computing environment. Further, Applicant contends that the McAfee Manual does not teach automatically alerting an administrator when a maintenance task, such as, reducing the size of the stored log files, is performed excessively. Further, Applicant contends that McFedries does not teach automatically alerting an administrator when a maintenance task is performed excessively on a server in a distributed computing environment. Instead, Applicant contends that McFedries teaches alerting a user when a maintenance task does not need to be performed and not when a maintenance task is performed excessively on a server in a distributed computing environment. Accordingly, Applicant contends that given that the combined teachings of the McAfee Manual and McFedries do not teach the presently amended claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims 12 and 25 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the McAfee Manual in view of McFedries be withdrawn and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the presently amended claims 12 and 25.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the presently amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the presently amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections and allowance of the presently amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28 in this case are respectfully requested. If these amendments do not result in a withdrawal of the claim rejections for the presently amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 26 and 28 and a Notice of Allowance, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview to accelerate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Silvy A. Murphy/

Silvy A. Murphy
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,959
P. O. Box 1254
Cary, North Carolina 27512
Phone: 919-859-2360
Fax: 919-233-9242